



RECEIVED
MAY 01 2003
GROUP 1700

9441742

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on April 25, 2003.

Rosalie A. Centeno
Rosalie A. Centeno, Secretary

Applicant: Wolfgang Peter et al

Art Group: 1742

Serial No.: 09/651,797

Attorney File No.: 00-0542

Filed: August 30, 2002

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR TREATMENT OF METALLIC
WORKPIECES

Examiner: Sikyin Ip

Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

a

pp
05/06/03

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED 03/25/2003

Dear Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action dated March 25, 2003 and with reference to the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002, Applicants submit the following comments:

In the Advisory Action, it is asserted that the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002 is not fully responsive to the rejection of the present application set forth in the Office Action of October 2, 2002.

Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion and submit that the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002 is fully responsive to the rejection of the present application set forth in the Office Action of

October 2, 2002.

In the Office Action of October 2, 2002, the sole grounds of rejection of claims 6 - 16 of the present application is the rejection of claims 6 - 16 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over US Patent No. 4,653,732 to Wunning et al. Applicants have submitted the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002 which traverses the rejection of claims 6 - 16 by specifically pointing out the differences between the apparatus for the thermal treatment of metallic workpieces recited in claims 6 - 16 of the present application and the device disclosed in US Patent No. 4,653,732 to Wunning et al. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002 fully responded to the sole grounds of rejection of claims 6 - 16 of the present application as set forth in the Office Action of October 2, 2002.

Additionally, in the Amendment dated January 2, 2003 in response to the Office Action of October 2, 2002, Applicants submitted new claims 17 - 20 for entry into the record. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C 101 et seq. and the other applicable requirements with respect to new claims 17 - 20. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application provides the required disclosure of the apparatus for the thermal treatment of metallic workpieces recited in new claims 17 - 20. However, Applicants earnestly solicit the Examiner to identify any feature of the apparatus for the thermal treatment of metallic workpieces recited in new claims 17 - 20 with respect to which it is believed that adequate support is not found in the present application and Applicants would be willing to point out the disclosure of such feature in the present application.

Applicants thus continue to submit that claims 6 - 20 are now in condition for allowance and that non-elected claims 1 - 5 should now be considered and early action toward these ends is respectfully requested.

However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to resolve any outstanding issues and expedite placement of the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. No. 26,255
for applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B
Tijeras, NM 87059

Telephone: (505) 286-3511
Facsimile: (505) 286-3524

RWB:mac